

Yuuki INOUE, S.N. 10/804,368
Page 11

Dkt. 2271/71533

REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated March 17, 2009. Claims 1, 12, 23, 34-39 and 41-43 were pending, with claims 2-11, 13-22, 24-33, 40 and 44-47 having previously been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer. By this Amendment, claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 have been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, claims 1, 12, 23, 34-39, and 41-43 remain pending upon entry of this amendment, with claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 being in independent form.

Claims 1, 12, 23, 34-39 and 41-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as purportedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,414,752 to Adam et al.

Applicant submits that the present application is allowable over the cited art, for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose or suggest the aspects of the present application of using a selected color profile to convert color data input in an RGB color space to converted color data in a CMYK color space of a second printer, for reproducing colors obtained by a first printer by applying the input color data, wherein color in an image formed by the second printer using device-dependent input color data is visually equal to color of an image formed by a first printer using converted device-dependent color data, and a difference between such colors may be effectively reduced, by converting input color data according to the color profile.

Adam, as understood by applicant, proposes a system for calibrating a scanner for scanning images formed by printers. The approach proposed in Adam involves creating a "printer profile" for each printer, paper and ink combination the user wishes to scan with the scanner. When a user desires to scan an image, the printer profile is used to calibrate the scanner in order to accurately scan the physical image, yielding an electronic representation of the image.

However, Adam does not disclose or suggest that color in an image formed by a second

Yuuki INOUE, S.N. 10/804,368
Page 12

Dkt. 2271/71533

printer may be made visually equal to color of an image formed by a first printer, or that a difference between such colors may be effectively reduced, by converting input color data according to a color profile.

Conversely, the scanner calibration method proposed by Adam does not, in any way whatsoever, change the output of any printer. Instead, the method proposed by Adam would change the behavior of a scanner to compensate for color differences resulting from various printer, paper and ink combinations used when forming an image.

Adam, column 2, lines 48-67, contrary to the contention in the Office Action, does not disclose or suggest changing the output of any printer, and instead points out the motivation for closed system color calibration. Adam proposes that a scanner in a printer-scanner combination should be subjected to the closed system color calibration in order to account for color differences between the color produced by a printer and the color reproduced by the color reproduction device (scanner).

Further, while the system of Adam includes a profiler (110) resident in a computer (100) and such profiler is connected to a printer (5), the profiler, as discussed in Damas, column 11, line 58 through column 12, line 4, merely causes the printer to print a color print target (that is, set of color patches), without profiling, which is then attached to a reference target (50) to create a combination that is scanned and processed to create a scanner profile (130), as well as printer profile (140). The printer profile 140 is used to control output by the printer 5 to more faithfully reproduce colors to match the reference target 5.

Such printer profile 140 is NOT used to convert color data input in an RGB color space to converted color data in a CMYK color space of a second printer, for reproducing colors obtained by a first printer by applying the input color data.

Yuuki INOUE, S.N. 10/804,368
Page 13

Dkt. 2271/71533

Applicant submits that the cited art, even when considered along with common sense and common knowledge to one skilled in the art, does **NOT** render unpatentable the above-mentioned aspects of the present application.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 12, 23 and 34, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentable over the cited art.

In view of the remarks hereinabove, applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicant earnestly solicits the allowance of the application.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition. The Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees that are required in connection with this amendment and to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul Teng, Reg. No. 40,837
Attorney for Applicant
Cooper & Dunham LLP
Tel.: (212) 278-0400

NJM